

| | | | |
|--------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/715,726 | SPLANE, ROBSON L. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Rodney B. White | 3636 | |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Rodney B. White. (3) _____

(2) David L. Davis (#24,812). (4) _____

Date of Interview: 22 April 2005.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 10.


Identification of prior art discussed: Logan, Jr. (U.S. Patent No. 5,626,389).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



RODNEY B. WHITE
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner's signature, if required

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed adding language to claims 1 and 10 to render the claims patentably distinct over the the above prior art, specifically that the seat overlying said open space in a substantially horizontal orientation and being fixedly secured to said at least one support member so that said seat pivots to a substantially vertical orientation relative to said base frame as said at least one support member pivots relative to said base frame since the seat in the Logan, Jr. reference remains in a substantially horizontal orientation while pivoting relative to the base frame.